

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed April 6, 2005, in which the Examiner advanced a final rejection. The Examiner has withdrawn the indefiniteness rejection but maintains the obviousness rejection. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's detailed "REMARKS/RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS." However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Applicant's arguments. For example, Applicant argued that "In contrast, the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 10 and 19, does not recite two communicating servers, but instead an application server and an application from the application server." The Examiner characterizes this argument as "Levergood discloses two communication servers as opposed to an application communicating with an application server" The Examiner further states " . . . the limitations recited in the claims do not preclude communication between two servers."

To the contrary, clearly, an "application from an application server" is an application that is executed by the application server and does not state or imply communication between two servers. Thus, the Examiner's reasoning with respect to a particular server of Levergood "acting in the client role," while Applicant disagrees, is irrelevant in any event.

The Examiner points to the disclosure at col. 6, lines 44-57 and Figure 5 as disclosing "forming and sending a user information request page . . ." Claim 1 recites "forming a user information request page by the application." (Remember, this is the application "from the application server.")

The Examiner appears to be improperly mixing Levergood's disclosed procedure of first checking to see if a user has an account (using information provided in a browser generated form, not the form in Fig. 5) – see col. 6, lines 36-66 – and generating a new account for a user who is qualified to open a new account (using information provided in a "on-line registration" form, as in Fig. 5) – see col. 7, lines 4-14.

To the extent the Examiner considers the authentication server to bootstrap a user account based on information extracted from the browser-generated form, then the form is not generated "by the application," since the form is generated by the browser.

To the extent the Examiner considers the authentication server to bootstrap a user account based on information extracted from the Fig. 5 form, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the "web application," while being *from* the application server, is distinct from the application server and, furthermore, claim 1 now explicitly recites particular communication between the web application and the application server. See, e.g., pages 11 and 12 of Applicant's specification for support for these amendments.


For example, claim 1 recites that the application server provides security registration data requirements, embedded in the forwarded user registration page request, to the user registration page of the web application. In addition, claim 1 now recites that the "user registration web page" of the web application merges the security registration data requirements from the application server with user profile registration requirements of the web application to form a user information request page.

Thus, claim 1 as amended is further distinguished from the disclosure of Levergood. As some examples, Levergood does not disclose or suggest providing security registration data requirements from an application server to an application, let alone embedded in a forwarded user registration page request. Nor does Levergood disclose or suggest a user registration web page of a web application merging security registration data requirements from the application server with user profile registration requirements of the web application to form a user information request page.

Claims 10 and 19 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments to claim 1.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER-WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300